

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16, 19, and 20 are pending in this application. Claims 17 and 18 are canceled by the present response without prejudice. Claims 1-16 and 19 are amended. Applicants submit no new matter is added.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0006133 to Kakemizu et al. (herein "Kakemizu"). That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Initially, applicants note the claims are amended by the present response to clarify certain features therein. The claims as written are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a mobile communication system in which a mobile node device transmits an authentication and accounting request necessary for a service of a desired service content related to an accounting other than a packet communication service to an AAAH (authentication, authorization, and accounting home) server device. Then, the AAAH server device carries out the authentication and accounting process for the mobile node device according to the authentication and accounting request. The service of the desired service content includes at least a service that requires a process for a payment of a charged amount to another party by the AAAH server device and a process for a transfer of the charged amount to the communication fee of a user of the mobile node device.

Independent claim 7 is directed to a mobile node device that can receive a service of a desired service content related to an accounting other than a packet communication service, with respect to an AAAH server device for supporting an authentication and accounting service with respect to a utilization of the packet communication service associated with an accounting of a communication fee of the mobile node device. The service of the desired service content includes at least a service that requires a process for a payment of a charged

amount to another party by the AAAH server device and a process for a transfer of the charged amount to the communication fee of a user of the mobile node device.

The AAAH server device of claim 11 receives an authentication and accounting request for a service of a desired service content related to an accounting other than a packet communication service from a mobile node device according to the authentication and accounting request. The service of the desired service content includes at least a service that requires a process for payment of a charged amount to another party by the AAAH server device and a process for a transfer of the charged amount to the communication fee of a user of the mobile node device.

The outstanding rejection relies on Kakemizu to disclose a mobile node device having the claimed “transmission unit” at paragraph [0128].<sup>1</sup> Applicants traverse that basis for the outstanding rejection.

The claimed “transmission unit” in each of independent claims 1 and 11 is explicitly required to transmit an authentication and accounting request for a service of a desired service content related to an accounting other than a packet communication service. Further, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 7, and 11, the service of the desired service content includes at least a service that requires a process for a payment of a charged amount to another party by the AAAH server device and a process for a transfer of the charged amount to the communication fee of a user of the mobile node device.

Paragraph [0128] in Kakemizu is not directed to any such features. In fact paragraph [0128] in Kakemizu does not even disclose or suggest that any request is transmitted from a mobile node, and that disclosure in Kakemizu clearly does not disclose or suggest any teaching related to a service of a desired content including at least a service that requires a process for a payment of a charged amount to another party by the AAAH server device and

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of August 14, 2007, page 2, prenumbered paragraph 7.

a process for a transfer of the charged amount to the communication fee of a user of the mobile node device. Noted paragraph [0128] in Kakemizu merely broadly discloses a mobile node can communicate with other terminal devices, but that disclosure in Kakemizu does not disclose or suggest the recited authentication and accounting request necessary for a service of a desired service content related to an accounting other than a packet communication service being transmitted to the AAAH server device, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 7, and 11.

The outstanding grounds for rejection also relies on Kakemizu to disclose the claimed “information recording unit” configured to record communication fee information regarding a communication fee to be charged to a user of the mobile node device in paragraph [0011].<sup>2</sup> Applicants further traverse that grounds for the outstanding rejection.

The above-noted feature has not been amended in the claims and that feature is believed to clearly distinguish over Kakemizu. Specifically, the claimed information recording unit is explicitly required to record a communication fee to be charged to a user of the mobile node device. Paragraph [0011] of Kakemizu does not mention any communication fee information being recorded, and Kakemizu further fails to disclose or suggest recording a communication fee to be charged by a user. Paragraph [0011] in Kakemizu refers to an authentication, authorizing, an accounting processes, but that is only a usual authentication and accounting processes for packet communication provided by an AAAH server. That disclosure is not directed to a communication fee to be charged to a user of the mobile node device.

---

<sup>2</sup> Office Action of August 14, 2007, page 3, prenumbered paragraph 9.

The outstanding rejection further relies on Kakemizu to disclose the previously recited “processing unit to carry out authentication and accounting processes” in paragraphs [0019] to [0038].<sup>3</sup> Applicants further traverse that grounds for the outstanding rejection.

The claimed “authentication and accounting process unit” is required to carry out a processing for providing a service of a desired service content. Kakemizu does not disclose or suggest such features. Paragraphs [0019] to [0038] of Kakemizu do not even mention any accounting service, and clearly fail to disclose or suggest a processing for providing a service of a desired service content. In fact, paragraphs [0019] to [0038] of Kakemizu merely mention a service control information for use in providing a communication service, not an accounting service, along with a location registration request information and a location registration reply information,<sup>4</sup> or along with an authentication request, an address request, an authentication reply, and an address reply.<sup>5</sup>

Thereby, Kakemizu further fails to disclose or suggest any teaching for an AAAH server to also carry out a processing for providing service of a desired service content requested by authentication and accounting request received from a mobile node device, as also required by independent claims 1 and 11. Kakemizu similarly fails to disclose or suggest a mobile node device to receive a service of a desired service content from an AAAH server device, as recited in independent claim 7.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit each of amended independent claims 1, 7, and 11, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over Kakemizu.

With respect to independent claim 19, the clarified method for providing a mobile node device information therein notifies a state of a mobile node from a prescribed server to a

---

<sup>3</sup> Office Action of August 14, 2007, page 3, prenumbered paragraph 10.

<sup>4</sup> See Kakemizu specifically at paragraphs [0019]-[0023].

<sup>5</sup> See Kakemizu specifically at paragraphs [0024]-[0038].

WWW server. Further, the state includes at least a first state in which the mobile node device is located at a home network, a second state in which the mobile node device is located at a visited network, and a third state in which the mobile node device is not located in either the home or visited network. The home agent device or the AAAH server device detects a first state or the second state according to a mobile registration request transmitter from the mobile node device, and detects the third state according to a fact that the mobile registration request is not transmitted from the mobile node device within a life time after detecting the second state. The above-noted features are now positively recited in independent claim 19 by the presently submitted amendments.

Applicants submit Kakemizu fail to disclose or suggest any updating of a display format of a prescribed display content for a mobile node according to the notified state of the mobile node at a WWW page provided by the WWW server device as recited in independent claim 19. In that respect applicants note Kakemizu does not even mention any display format of a display content for a mobile node at a WWW page. The grounds for rejection of claim 19 based on Kakemizu is not based on any proper analysis of claim 19 relative to Kakemizu.

Applicants also note the outstanding rejection does not appear to have even addressed the features recited in claim 19 specifically, and in that respect the features in claim 19 differ from the specifically addressed features such as in claim 1.

Claim 20 is also believed to distinguish over Kakemizu, although claim 20 is not amended by the present response. Claim 20 is directed to a method of confirming a correspondent terminal that requests a confirmation of a host name or a set of a host name and the user name, before a call setup procedure, comparing the identification information for the purpose of confirming the host name or the set of the host name and the user name, and then carrying out a call setup procedure between two terminal devices only when an affirmative response is received.

First applicants note the outstanding rejection has failed to address claim 20 specifically, and the features specifically recited therein. In that respect applicants note claim 20 differs from the other claims, and particularly from claim 1.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit Kakemizu clearly fails to disclose or suggest the features in claim 20 as Kakemizu fails to provide any disclosure or teaching for requesting a confirmation of a host name or a set of a host name and a user name, before a call setup procedure, comparing the identification information for the purpose of confirming the host name or the set of the host name and the user name, and then carrying out a call setup procedure between two terminal devices only when an affirmative response is received. Thereby, applicants respectfully submit independent claim 20 also clearly distinguishes over the applied art to Kakemizu.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over the applied art to Kakemizu.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423